

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 stand rejected and claims 3-5, 8-10, and 13-15 are objected to. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In light of the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 339,585 (“Hulyalkar”). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 not present in the cited reference is the “connection controlling unit for connecting said disconnected client terminal to said searched client terminal by said search controlling unit independent of the plurality of access points.” This limitation is not present in the cited reference.

In the present application, when a fault occurs at an access point, the client terminal connected to this access point does get disconnected. The disconnected client terminal then connects to another client terminal independent of a central controller thereby maintaining a connection to the access point. Each of the independent claims explicitly requires that the client terminal re-establishes the connection to the access point not a central controller.

In Hulyalkar, a central controller CC controls the connections between wireless terminals and base stations as well as wireless terminals in temporary

forwarder nodes. The Office Action recognizes that in Hulyalkar “there is still a requirement of a central controller to control the signal/control information and available slot allocation, and it is the data information between the WT (wireless terminal) and the CC (central control) that is distributed such that each WT, during its slot ‘piggy-backs’ its control information to the CC, where (among other control) messages, it specifies the number of slots requested for the next CDF.” Office Action at 5. Thus, it is clear that in Hulyalkar, the central controller is required as opposed to Applicant’s claims in which the search control is done independent of a central controller, i.e., the access point. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejected claims be allowed.

Additionally, as pointed out in the Office Action, the BS/CC assigns periodically a certain number of E-burst slots to no particular WT. Here the WT randomly selects one of these unassigned slots to ask for the request of a slot in a succeeding CDF. However, while the WT may select one of these unassigned slots, they are initially assigned by the BS/CC. The search control is done in conjunction with the central controller which assigns the E-burst slots to be used. Therefore, connections are never made without instruction from central control.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the

Application No.: 09/535,893

Docket No.: U1927.0008/P008

Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: September 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 835-1400  
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs